REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner objected to the Information Disclosure Statement; rejected claims 40 and 66 under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph; rejected claims 4-8, 13, 17-21, 26, 30-34, 39, 43-47, 52, 56-60, 65, 69-73, 78, 82-86, 91, 95-99, and 104 under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1-4, 14-17, 27, 29, 30, 40-43, 53-56, 66, 68, 69, 79-82, 92, 94, and 95 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,801,999 to Venkatesan et al. ("*Venkatesan*");and rejected claims 5-13, 18-26, 28, 31-39, 44-52, 57-65, 67, 70-78, 83-91, 93, and 96-104 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Venkatesan* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,618 to Downs et al. ("*Downs*").

By this amendment, Applicants cancel claims 1-395 and add new claims 396-433. Claims 396-433 remain pending.

The Examiner objected to the Information Disclosure Statement for not including translations of numerous foreign references. However, either an English Abstract has been supplied for the foreign references, or they have been cited in at least one enclosed English language search report. Accordingly, the Examiner should withdraw the objection to the Information Disclosure Statement.

Claims 1-104 have been cancelled, and therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot. Furthermore, Applicants assert that the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every element of new claims 396-433.

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Independent claim 396 recites "[a] multimedia content delivery system for sending predetermined content data from an information sending apparatus to an information receiving apparatus," including "means for encrypting the second identification with the content data by a content key ... means for encrypting the content key by the individual key ... means for decrypting the encrypted content key using the individual key to acquire the content key ... means for decrypting the encrypted second identification information with the content data by using the content key to acquire the second identification information and the content data." *Venkatesan* fails to disclose at least the claimed "individual key."

In *Venkatesan*, a client receives an encrypted object and an encrypted license for that object. The license is decrypted to acquire a symmetric encryption key, which is then used to decrypt the encrypted object, (*Venkatesan*, col. 31, lines 48-67). However, *Venkatesan*'s symmetric encryption key does not constitute the claimed "individual key" because it is not for "encrypting the content key" nor "decrypting the encrypted content key," as required by claim 1, because the object is not a "content key" as claimed. Accordingly, *Venkatesan* fails to anticipate claim 396.

Downs fails to cure the deficiencies of Venkatesan. Downs fails to disclose the claimed "individual key." Accordingly, Venkatesan and Downs, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose the subject matter of independent claim 396.

Independent claims 410 and 422, while different in scope than independent claim 396, distinguish over *Venkatesan* and *Downs* for at least the same reasons as claim 396.

Claims 397-409, 411-421, and 423-433 depend from independent claims 396, 410, and 422, respectively.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 28, 2007

Michael R. Kelly

Reg. No. 33,921